



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,098	10/30/2001	Masaaki Kawasumi	112A 3189	5240

7590 08/14/2003  
KODA & ANDROLIA  
Suite 3850  
2029 Century Park East  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, GERALD A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/022,098

Applicant(s)

KAWASUMI ET AL.

Examiner

JERRY A ANDERSON

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The drawing Figure is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: . Correction is required. All of the drawings should be reviewed to ensure the accuracy of the reference signs.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the motors of claim 4 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a

Art Unit: 3637

manner as to present a complete operative device. The body may be blow-molded "of" a resin but not "by" a resin, see claims 1 and 3. Terms which make the claims indefinite include: "their" in claim 1, "its" in claim 3, "". Terms in the claims which lack proper antecedent basis include: "hollow spaces" in claim 1, claim 1 has no antecedent basis for the "top plate" or "upward opening" in claim 3. Lines of claim are indefinite. Claim 1 is misdescriptive because the front panel 25 does not comprise "a panel body 38 for covering the forward opening" 24b. It is not understood how the frame member 47 regulates the "inward dislocation of" the sidewalls or how dislocation is used in "defining the forward opening". The front panel does cover a cover an upper front part of the casing or a portion of the opening 24b. Misspelled in line , of claim is "".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims , as presented, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by.

### ***Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

Art Unit: 3637

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, as presented, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snell et al in view of Kruck et al. Snell is cited showing a box 10 with side walls 12, 13 and 40, 41, a front part 51, see figure 8, having a frame part 53, a top plate 22 having an engaging portions 30, 31 and counterpart engaging portions 40, 41. Snell fails to disclose blow molded panels filled with foamed material. Generally the selection of well-known material based on its suitability for the intended use is considered an obvious matter of design choice. Here foamed material between molded panels is well known in the art as shown by Kruck et al. Therefore it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to have modified with foamed material between molded panels as panels for a box is an obvious matter of design choice. Since the references are from the same field of endeavor the purpose of Kruck would have been obvious in the pertinent art of Snell at the time of the invention it would have

Art Unit: 3637

been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Snell with a in view of Kruck.

The applicant may argue that the front panel and frame member are not integrally constructed by blow molding. The applicant's claims are drawn to a product or apparatus. It is well settled in case law that where the product is not patentably distinct over the prior art, process limitations cannot impart patentability. In re Stephens et al 52 CCPA 1409, 345 E 2d 1020. 145 USPQ 656.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry Anderson whose telephone number is 703 038 2202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703 308 24668. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 3597 for regular communications and 703 306 4195 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 2197.

Jaa  
August 9, 2003



GERALD A. ANDERSON  
PATENT EXAMINER